

MANITOBA MATTERS

Being a short chapter devoted and
dedicated to the Davis-Royal
administration.

The autonomy of provinces no
longer respected.

Ottawa dictates - Manitoba obeys.

by
JOHN H.O'DONNELL.

Winnipeg
Printed at the Herald Office.

The Government of Manitoba:

Why the Representatives of the People should Oppose the present Administration.

BY

JOHN H. O'DONNELL.

One of the ablest writers in the Dominion some years since pointed out the danger to the individual provinces of the Dominion, especially to the newer ones, that was likely to result from Confederation. Said he, "You may draw up Bills of Rights, Declarations of Independence, and frame Provincial Constitutions with the utmost exactness, but depend upon it, the power which is about to be relegated to a body of political partisans at Ottawa, will eventually prove to be the greatest enemy with which the Provincial Local Legislatures will have to deal." That central "enemy" has already made itself felt in the case of Nova Scotia. Indeed the power was exerted long before it assumed an exterior form, for the Province alluded to was declared confederated without the consent of the people, just as now we have in this Province the constitution violated to suit the whim and the dictum of a political party chief at Ottawa.

There is one right always inestimable to the people who exercise it, but formidable to tyrants, and it is that of conducting their local affairs without the interference of Federal authority. In the United States of America the question of States rights has long been discussed and various opinions have been expressed as to the exact line between State and Federal authority, yet it has been mutually conceded that the State has a certain constitution which can suffer no interference from the general power, and any attempt to so interfere would be regarded as an unlawful intervention, and as we have seen would be resisted with force. Though a State in the American Republic has more control over its local affairs than a Province of the Dominion has over its affairs, yet the Province is not without its privileged autonomy, and let it be mentioned here that the present political party chief at Ottawa, Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, has on several occasions pretended to be the conservator and protector of Provincial Rights; but it is only a pretence, since it may be shown that when it suits his purpose he can either des-

troy or defend the autonomy of a Province by dictating to its people what they must do in order to receive his admiration and support. Manitoba was declared a Province of the Dominion, and Heaven knows that it was a greater punishment than she deserved, not that it was dishonorable to be politically a member of the Dominion Confederacy, but because she was encumbered with unnecessary burdens, and denied those rights and privileges which were given to the other members of the compact. She was handed a document called the Manitoba Act, which among other things provided her with an irresponsible government and a Lieutenant-Governor whose record no one has yet been found to defend. This Constitution has been repeatedly violated by the caprice of a Lieutenant-Governor or to suit the political necessities of the party in power. From the date of the admission of Manitoba as a Province of the Dominion until the present hour, the Constitution of Manitoba has been a dead letter. The present Lieutenant-Governor has disregarded it although professing to be a great Conservative. The administration of the day, and that which preceded it, have treated the Constitution with contempt, and have done what they pleased, and what pre-eminent ignorance alone could suggest. The present Lieutenant-Governor for some time has been the sole custodian and protector of the people's rights under their Constitution, but it has suited him to do that which party interest has commanded. His love for office and his fondness for pomp and casual advantages, have been enough to overcome all scruples of conservatism, and accordingly we find him giving his assent to measures wholly unconstitutional, and acting in concert with men whose political course has been marked by dishonesty, wrong and incompetency.

In the course of a few brief pages it would be impossible to do justice to a subject which in the range of its discussion comprises revolution, murder, incompetency, dishonesty and extravagance. I shall therefore content myself with merely pointing out some of those grievances which the present Local Administration, together with the present Administrator, have contributed to the general misery of the Manitoba public. It has been seen that the Province was furnished with a Constitution, and that it was accepted at the time by those who claimed to have the authority as the "representatives of the people." It is well laid down that any alteration of such constitution or agreement should not be made for light and transient causes, and when so made such alteration should be done by the direct vote of the people. A Parliament or a legislative body voting itself out of existence is certainly a novelty in political history. Important alterations in the constitution of a State should not be made by a body of men elected to legislate under that constitution. The people who are the depositaries of power, and who are directly affected by such alteration or change are the ones to originate and carry out the changes. These truths are self-evident, and they have their advocates even at this hour, on a subject kindred to that which has been raised in this Province. Mr. David Milis who for some years has been advocating a different mode of constituting the Senate of the Dominion, though a Radical and a Grit, has not yet undertaken to introduce a measure to alter the mode of constituting the Upper Chamber or of abolishing it. His resolutions heretofore intro-

duced have only affirmed an abstract principle, viz., that a different mode of constituting the Senate is desirable. Here he has commenced to mark time. It is true that he has forecast some kind of a system by which senators are to be elected by the Local Legislatures, but neither Mr. Mills nor any of his supporters, in this matter have undertaken to declare that this alteration shall be effected and effected solely by a vote in the House of Commons. On the contrary the advocates are making it a question of direct appeal to the people, and so far as the present members of the Senate are concerned he does not wish to interfere with them. New senators he would have elected according to his scheme, leaving death and other causes to remove those now comprising the Senate.

The Upper House of Manitoba, though comprising only seven members, is as much a part of the Constitution of this Province as the Senate is of the British North America Act, yet it seems that while this is held to be fact by Alex. Mackenzie, David Mills and Edward Blake, and while it would not be quite correct for a House of Commons to abolish its Senate without making it a direct question, yet the Senate of this Province can be abolished by a simple bill, without any appeal to the people, without any reference to that power which should govern in all free countries, and this because a Mr. Mackenzie, a political party leader at Ottawa, says you must do it or you won't get any more money. This has actually taken place. It has indeed come to pass that an individual not responsible to the people of this Province in any manner that has yet been discovered, but who as Premier of the Dominion, and therefore the custodian of provincial rights, refuses to grant that which a candid world acknowledges is only right and just, absolutely refuses at first, but eventually consents, by making it a *sine qua non*, that the Constitution of the Province must first be violated and a wholesome check on the popular body must be done away with. Must one go far for the reason? Certainly not. Mr. Mackenzie is a party politician. Party Government, and consequently Power, is one of the biggest planks in his structure. He has played for it through many a day. He has moreover shown by his acts that he is not in favor of the independence of Local Legislatures. When he was merely a member of the Opposition, he was, of course, the champion of Local Legislatures. He accused the leader of the Government at the time of having made the Local Legislatures subservient to his purposes. It was corrupt for John A. Macdonald to do that, but now the case is altered. What was corrupt in an opponent is now purity itself. An Upper House, it must be confessed, no matter how constituted, is always more or less of a check on dishonesty and incompetency.

It is not difficult for the central Power to manipulate the people's representatives, especially when they comprise such easy virtues as that possessed by a Davis, a Royal or a Norquay, but the fewer obstacles to overcome the better and the cheaper. The more the local power is curtailed, the more does it pass into the hands of the Central Government. The merest glance at the political history of the Dominion since Confederation, will fully confirm this startling truth, and it has already been said by a competent authority, that year by year the Local Legislatures are becoming contemptible, while correspondingly the Central

Government is absorbing all power. The tendency is so great in that direction that it is now impossible to resist it. Hence we are building up a class of unscrupulously ambitious men who are not checked by any local restraints, whose home is the Dominion, whose residence is Ottawa, and whose chief end is to concentrate all the power among themselves and leave little or none to others. That modesty which at an earlier day made them more careful is no longer exhibited, they now boldly step forth, and dictate and command. Their mandate is obeyed because they have it in their power to make their suppliants bend to their wishes.

I think I have fully established the position that the tendency of the Central Government is to dictate and control the Local Governments. Ontario has furnished us with a most notable instance. The latest interference is that which immediately affects this Province. At the time Messrs. Royal and Davis started for Ottawa on a pauper's mission, I took the ground that the Ottawa Government would be doing an injustice to the people of the Dominion, and to the people of this Province, if money were paid to such individuals as comprise the present Local Administration upon their own representations, and without enquiry and without imposing certain just and necessary conditions.

The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie had informed a previous beggar's deputation in terms that are unmistakable, that before any Better Terms could be conceded "the expenditure of the Province should be brought within the income." This was a perfectly just stipulation, but what authority has Mr. Mackenzie or any other Ottawa potentate to order amendments to, or alterations in the constitution of a Province? His duty as the custodian of the rights of provinces began and ended when he imposed the conditions that the expenditure should be kept within the income.

If there was any justice or decency in the Manitoba Better Terms delegations to Ottawa it was based upon the assumption that the Province had never been fairly or honestly dealt with by the Dominion Government. This is the ground taken by "better terms" advocates from first to last, and Mr. Mackenzie's dictatorial policy of abolishing the Upper House as a measure of public economy is false, unjust and absurd.

The Council was abolished under circumstances of corruption and dishonesty, arising out of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's dogmatic declaration that you must abolish your Upper House or you won't get a cent. We shall presently see how far the economical feature has been realized. Before proceeding in that direction I may as well here refer to a matter which creates both amusement and disgust to those who hate humbug, no matter how ingeniously disguised.

The sheets in the eastern provinces in the pay of the present Dominion Government from time to time publish small items and paragraphs complimenting the people of Manitoba on having got rid of a useless and expensive encumbrance. The *Toronto Globe*, *Montreal Herald* and the *London Advertiser* are among those journals which see a great reason for congratulation. If any or all of those journals were really reaching after the truth as it is known here, they would probably be a little more rational when they undertake to discuss Manitoba affairs.

The *Globe* for a long time has derived its inspiration in Manitoba matters from a professional factotum of the individual who says he is the Premier of the Province, a kind of journalistic failure who occupies his time, it is said, copying letters in a government office. As for the other two journals, they have, I understand, always been too mean to incur the expenses of a paid correspondent, though it is cause for congratulation no doubt, as it would be a great calamity to be afflicted with any such qui ninnies as the Government hanger on here who represents the *Globe* and easily deludes it and its reflectors into the perpetration of the most insane folly.

And now to the economy of the thing. Has the country saved anything by the abolition of the Upper House? If so in what way has the saving been effected?

The entire cost of the Legislative Council of this Province last year was nearly \$7,000. The estimates for the year ending 30th June 1877, show that the item under Miscellaneous (which is only another name for leakage and plunder) has been increased from \$10,000 to \$15,300, and the item of Printing which was \$8,000 last year has been increased to \$10,000. Thus it will be seen that the very two items which afford the best chance for plunder have been increased respectively 50 per cent. and 25 per cent., while it is a notable fact that the Premier has money invested in the Queen's Printing Establishment, and if the reports are correct, drawing his percentage at the Jewish rate of twenty-four per cent. per annum. I make these statements fully conscious of their importance. Let them be contradicted.

Is this the kind of economy which Mr. Mackenzie himself practices at Ottawa? If it is, the sooner he disappears from the political stage the better for the whole country. At all events it is to be hoped that the public will be spared the infliction of seeing items in the honorable gentleman's sheets congratulating the people of this Province on the wholesome economy that has been brought about. The statements, to fall back on a street phrase, are a little "too thin," and must recoil, like all the clap-trap which the Hon. Dominion Premier and his political ape here have from time to time employed to carry out a purpose. I shall put side by side the estimates for last year and those already voted for the year ending 30th June, 1877. They will show that the Upper House has been abolished, and that the Government have applied the amount under that head to purposes which have the convenient given terms of "Miscellaneous" and "Printing." As for showing that the country saves anything by the transaction, the Premier might as well undertake to show what became of the \$10,000 his Government spent last year under the accommodating "Miscellaneous," or to him very profitable item of "Printing." Languages! Is not that one of the greatest and most expensive nuisances with which the Province is afflicted? Have not the people frequently demanded the abolition of that nuisance, and have we not heard Davis and some of his supporters tell the people it would be done as a measure of economy? But when they obtain power their promises are broken and forgotten. They have proved recreant to the power that made them, for the sake of a little temporary advantage; but, like all who possess easy virtue, they will soon be taught the lesson which has been taught to hundreds of others like themselves.

The total amount of the Estimates for the year ending the 30th of June, next is \$93,450. This amount indicated at the time an expenditure over income of about \$28,000. The estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1877, amount to \$95,000. It is not unlikely that in both instances they will be exceeded. In fact we have already had the intimation from the Premier's organ that the expenditure for the present year will be greater than the amount estimated. A comparison of items will show that the boasted economy of the present Administration is altogether mythical.

Civil Government in the estimates for 1876 is to cost \$16,850. In the estimates for 1877 it is to cost \$19,200, being \$2,350 additional. The Legislative Assembly in the '76 estimates is put at \$10,200. Next year it is to cost us \$12,200, or \$2,000 additional. The total cost of both branches of the Legislature in the current estimates is \$13,600—\$10,200 for the Legislative Assembly, and \$3,400 for the Legislative Council. Now that the latter body is abolished, the cost of one Chamber is increased from \$10,200 to \$12,200, so that the cost of the Legislative Assembly alone is brought to within \$1,400 of the former cost of both. But even this sum of \$1,400 is not saved. It is saved in the particular instance, but it disappears in the shape of an increase of something else, or the creation of a new and unnecessary expenditure—such, for instance, as that of the Superintendent of Public Works—an office which calls for an annual expenditure of \$900 as salary for the President, and no doubt a further expenditure for "incidentals" in connection with the office. Take the item of Incidentals in the estimates for the year '76, and for both Houses. They amount to \$1,200 for the Assembly and \$885 for the Council. The Council is now defunct, but the incidentals for the Assembly *alone* are estimated for '77 at *three thousand two hundred dollars*, or one thousand seven hundred and fifteen dollars more than the former incidentals of both Houses. Yet the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie and certain members of the House of Commons get up in their places, and congratulated the Government of this country on their determination to practice economy!

Saving the apparent economy realized by the abolition of the Upper House, hardly a single item has been left out or reduced; but the rule of increase has been followed in numerous instances. The item of Printing, in the estimates for '76, is put at \$8,000. In those for '77 this item is \$10,000, or \$2,000 additional. (The Premier, it is said, has an interest in that business, hence an increase in that item could not be overlooked.) The item known as Miscellaneous, but better described as Plunder, as already shown, has been increased from \$10,000 to \$15,300. Notwithstanding the abolition of the Upper House, the total estimates for '77 are more, by one thousand five hundred and fifty dollars, than those of '76. Where the economy comes in is a mystery which defies solution. A Government that spends one-ninth of its revenue in public Printing, and one-fourth of the said income in Miscellaneous and Incidentals, is hardly the body to be esteemed as economical. The Private Secretary, the Messengers, the light, fuel and water for His Majesty the Lieutenant-Governor, and the sessional clerks and sundry expenses of the Assembly, amount to more than the appropriation for Education. Ten thousand dollars to the Queen's Printer, and

only seven thousand for Education! What a travesty on public economy! Two thousand dollars for sessional clerks in a House of twenty-four members! Why, it is more than Ottawa pays for such leakage. Two thousand dollars for sessional clerks, Mr. Mackenzie, \$4,000 for incidental expenses connected with the palace of His Most Illustrious Majesty the Lieutenant-Governor. Twelve hundred dollars for Stationery, and only two thousand for Immigration and Agriculture! One thousand dollars to the Clerk of the Executive Council, and only seven hundred to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly. Twelve hundred dollars to a Deputy Provincial Treasurer, and another twelve hundred for a Deputy Provincial Secretary, and nothing for either of them to do! Such is the character of the economy echoed at Ottawa, and re-echoed by the organs of the dominant faction in this country. If the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie practices the same kind of economy at Ottawa as that which he commends in Manitoba, there is then some hope that his political career will soon draw to a close. The world is hardly advanced enough, or too much advanced, to accept such economy as he admires and practices. A Province with an income of ninety-five thousand dollars, and spends the greater part of it in salaries and printing, is hardly the country to which well-disposed people should be invited to come. The slightest glance at the estimates will show that the sum of forty thousand dollars is paid for Salaries and Printing. Nearly one-half the entire revenue paid out for salaries of Ministers, Clerks and Printing! Yet it is amusing to hear Mr. Mackenzie and his newspapers tell the people of this country that the Government are practising economy. Will Mr. Mackenzie or some one else point out the particular instance where this asserted economy has been practiced? If the abolition of the Legislative Council be pointed to, as it has already been adduced as an evidence, how would the matter stand when it was shown and conclusively proved, that the expenditure is greater than it has ever been before; that the money supposed to be saved has been applied to something else far more outrageous than the Legislative Council ever could have become?

If Mr. Davis and his associates were really sincere in their endeavors to govern the Province with economy, they would have gone to work in a different fashion. Senator Girard (a pensioner on the Government of this Province), has publicly admitted in Ottawa and elsewhere, that the object in abolishing the Upper House was not to save money, but to get rid of a body that showed a disposition to interfere with the Government. The cost was nothing, says the Senator; but it was embarrassing to the Government to have their acts checked and controlled by an irresponsible body. On the other hand, Mr. Mackenzie congratulates the people of this Province on having got rid of an expensive institution. Let Mr. Mackenzie and his Government practice what he preaches, and abolish the Senate of the Dominion! It is not only an expensive body, but an impudent one, according to his view. (Vide his remarks on hearing of the defeat of the Railway Bill of last session.)

Those who make a stand against Davis and the concern called Government in this Province, contend that were there any sincerity in Davis, or his associates, they would have lopped branches which notori-

ously affected the political trunk. Why must the English-speaking people of this Province—by far the great majority of the population—be compelled to pay \$12,000 or \$15,000 a year for the luxury of the French language?

The public has already heard of a certain Bill to *diminish* the expenses of the Legislature of Manitoba, and a very important mistake was made in the title of the Bill. It should read, a Bill to *increase* the expenses of the Legislature of Manitoba. That there has been an increase instead of a decrease, I think I have fully proved. At the second reading of the Bill in the Legislative Council I made the following remarks: "Whatever the grounds were on which they sought to abolish the Upper House, it appeared to me that they had not been stated. "If they had been stated, then this whole piece of legislation was of the most bungling and contemptible character. This was a bill to diminish the expenditure, forsooth; and Ottawa had put her foot down and demanded its passage peremptorily. The Legislature and people of Manitoba would no doubt, one day find out the real reason for the movement."

That reason is apparent enough now. Instead of diminishing the expenditure, it has been increased; instead of economy, we have the most barefaced extravagance. One-fourth of the whole revenue expended under such items as Miscellaneous and Incidentals. And yet we must be told by the partisan newspapers in the pay of Ottawa and the Local Government that great economy has been practiced, and on the strength of this falsehood the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie becomes a party to public deception by assisting Davis and his associates to handle and expend more money than before! Were the Local Administration actuated by motives of honesty and sincerity they would have adopted an entirely different system of retrenchment than that which they have had the audacity to assert is a reduction of the public expenditure. Had their intentions been honest, they would have just begun with the sessional allowance to members. That might have been reduced to \$5 per day during the session. This would have given \$100 to each member for an average session. Leaving the Legislative Council in existence, for the whole thirty-one members this would have secured a total saving of \$6,400. Next, the two offices of Clerk of the Legislative Council and Clerk of the Executive Council might have been amalgamated. This would have effected a saving of \$1,000. The Deputy Provincial Secretary and the Deputy Treasurer might have likewise been amalgamated, and another saving of \$1,200 effected. The printing of the statutes in only one language—the legal language of the country—would have led to a further reduction of \$8,000. The abolition of the offices of President of the Council and Minister of Agriculture would have effected another saving of \$1,800. The abolition of the French language would have obviated the necessity of translators and French printing, thus saving \$2,000 at least. The item of Sessional clerks, instead of being put at \$2,000, should have been considered excessive at \$1,000, and thus another \$1,000 might have been saved in that leakage alone. The items under Miscellaneous and Incidentals, instead of costing us \$24,900, should have been put at a maximum cost of \$15,000, thus effecting a saving of nearly \$9,000, or in exact numbers \$8,700. The total saving thus effected would have been real, not.

apparent, and would have amounted to the large sum of \$30,100, being a little less than one-third of the new revenue upon which the estimates of '77 are based. This saving could have been effected reasonably and honestly, and the expenditure brought within the old income, leaving a surplus which might have been applied to the replacing of the amount taken from the capital account, or as supplementary to Education and Agriculture. But no; this would not suit either Mr. Davis and his associates or His Eminence the Lieutenant-Governor, who, by the way, represents a cost to this Province (exclusive of his salary and casual advantages) of at least \$4,000. The very assertion that either His Eminence the Lieutenant-Governor or their Royal Highnesses Davis & Co., mean to be economical in the administration of the affairs of this Province is contradicted in the most emphatic terms by their acts and by the facts and figures already published with their sanction and authority.

What Lieutenant-Governor Morris has done for this Province in the interests of constitutional government has yet to be shown. He may derive some momentary consolation from the supposition that it is one's inability to see the benefits of his ministration—an inability which he may suppose results from obtuseness; but such a supposition must disappear before the light of facts and figures. It is difficult to understand what claims His Eminence has either upon the country or the "Reform" party; difficult to understand why he should have been most recently invested with a commission to investigate certain well known land questions in this Province, when it is notorious that His Most Illustrious Eminence is accused of being one of the most extensive land jobbers and speculators within the Province. If his administration of land matters turn out no better than his administration of political affairs in the country, no one must be surprised. It may be safely relied upon, however, that Morris Estates are not likely to diminish in number under the new commission.

Before dismissing the financial question, let me add a few words about that marvellous contribution to the blue covered literature of the Province, the Public Accounts for the year ending 30th June, 1874.—These "Accounts" have attracted a little attention, chiefly owing to the number of mistakes and absurdities which they comprise. By a clumsy arrangement of dates and items the expenditure of eight months has been placed against the receipts of twelve. The four months omitted comprised the greatest bulk of the expenditure, so they are left out to make it appear that the expenditure was small. As Public Accounts generally mean the transactions for a whole year, this little piece of fraud was supposed to do effective duty; but like so many other acts of its perpetrators it was so transparent that the merest tyro detected it at a glance.

But if the Public Accounts to which I have reference are remarkable for what they show, they are likewise notorious for what they don't show. Though the Province commenced business on its own account with a capital fund of \$472,090 bearing interest at the rate of five per cent., which capital was shortly afterwards augmented to \$550,000 at the same rate of interest; yet it is well known that Davis and his predecessors have made heavy drafts on this capital to make up defi-

iciencies caused by extravagance and dishonesty. The present Government already admit that these deficiencies have reduced the aforesaid capital to \$158,386.11 (the first time they have made the admission), and that in consequence of such raids upon the capital the revenue of the Province, from Dominion sources, now amounted to only \$63,253.04. The exact amount of the raids is disputed. The Government claim the above is \$158,386.11, but authority infinitely preferable to those who are responsible for a large share of the diminution asserts that the whole amount of the raids is \$187,000.

As a balance sheet or financial statement showing the exact condition of the capital account has never been published in the Public Accounts (the only proper place for such information), the only way we can arrive at an approximate statement is indirectly through Ottawa. The Provincial Treasurer has in the House, on two separate occasions, made a verbal exposition of the capital account, but his budget has neither been plain, correct nor voluntary. In a way, he has undertaken to get over that difficulty with as much fog and confusion as possible; and when a member of the House has asked for a financial statement of the capital account from the date of confederation, together with the dates and the amounts of the various drafts, the matter has been pushed aside and purposely neglected by those whose duty it was to attend to it. It is, however, enough to say that the Public Accounts so far have contained no financial exhibit of the Capital Account, and that that which pretends to be a statement in the report of the last delegates to Ottawa is a confusion of figures similar to the verbal financial exposition which Mr. Davis finds it convenient to make to the House once a year.

The fact that the amount of capital money expended was a disputed question ought to have produced a lucid statement in printed form from the Treasurer. Even if usage must be discarded, the fact of setting himself right by an explicit statement from the Provincial books should have been seized upon; but the total absence of anything like a financial statement of the Capital Account, and the style in which the Public Accounts have been got up, prove Mr. Davis' financial and accounting abilities are limited to a slate pencil and a saloon.

In the report of the delegates of the Executive Council to Ottawa with regard to the claims of Manitoba upon the Dominion, occurs the following (page 5): "During these interviews with the honorable members of the Dominion Government, the delegates were able to show the spirit of strict economy with which the affairs of the Province had been administered by the members of the present Executive Council of Manitoba, and the great difficulty of effecting more retrenchment except by a simplification of the political machinery provided by the constitution of the Province. It is to be hoped that patriotism will render easy such a simplification, and will insure to the Province that increase of subsidy negotiated for by the delegates, without which it might be found necessary at no distant period to have recourse to direct taxation."

The falsehood of the above paragraph is only exceeded by its audacity. "The spirit of strict economy" with which the affairs of the Province "had been administered by the present members of the Executive Council of Manitoba." Why, it is notorious that the present

Executive Council have been, since they were called by His Eminence to administer its affairs, exceeding the revenue, bringing down estimates far in advance of the income, and making raids upon the Capital Account, to make up the deficiency. That is the spirit of economy with a vengeance. It is true, Ottawa has made an additional grant; but suppose she had not made it. Davis and his Executive (including His Eminence) would have drawn upon capital all the same. The advantage they had received by the additional subsidy is, I conceive, this: They have got the actual revenue from Dominion sources increased to \$90,000, and they will make further annual drafts upon the capital so that they will spend at least \$120,000. This may be expected as the spirit of economy spoken of. In whatever shape the subject is looked at the fraud is prominent.

Mr. Mackenzie had better look to his laurels, or a Davis will vanquish him in the arts which make "the post of honor the private station."

On page 11 of the Report is another "spirit of economy" spread out. "The present Government of the Province have, since their formation, carried out the policy of the strictest economy and of retrenchment compatible with the increasing demands upon the revenue which they then inaugurated." We have seen how far the retrenchment has been carried,—increased expenditure, increased estimates,—a prospective expenditure next year of \$1,500 over the *estimated* expenditure this year; and, a reduction of the Capital Account from \$550,000 to less than \$400,000. But His Most Illustrious Eminence the Lieutenant-Governor has been most graciously pleased to give his assent and consent to the fraud, and therefore it is sanctified with the "oath of office."

Again occurs the following: "These demands originate chiefly from the fact that the population is rapidly growing in every district of the Province, and add every year materially to the expenditure connected with the education, roads and bridges, agriculture, and administration of justice services." Let us see how these charges have added to the services alluded to. In 1871 the expenditure for Education was \$6,000; in 1872, \$7,000; in 1873 the same; in 1874 the same; in 1875 the same; in 1876 the same; and in 1877, prospectively the same—\$1,000 of an increase in six years, and that increase not under the present patriotic Executive Council, but under one which has been declared less patriotic and less honest. The increased subsidy obtained under false representation does not appear to have benefitted the schools, as the estimated expenditure this year and next put the Educational appropriation at the old figure, \$7,000. No "material" increase there.

Take the item of Roads, the next referred to in the paragraph. In 1871 the Road Service cost \$19,613.10; in 1872, \$11,854.10, being a decrease of \$7,759; in 1873, \$8,920.84, being a decrease on the preceding year of \$2,933.26, or *ten thousand six hundred and ninety-two dollars and twenty-six cents on the original appropriation*. In 1873 only \$3,851.38 was expended, being a decrease on the original of \$15,761.72. In 1875 the estimated expenditure was \$9,000, but we have no means of knowing that the amount was actually expended on the service pretended,

as the work done was not let out by public tender, but given over to political friends of the Treasurer or Minister of Public Works. Still, admitting that the whole amount was actually expended in the service indicated, it is less than one-half of what was expended in 1871, less than it was in 1872, and very little more than what it was in 1873. But in 1876, under an increased revenue from Ottawa, the expenditure for Road Service is to be actually \$1,000 less than it was before the delegates went to Ottawa and said to Mr. Mackenzie, "These demands "originate chiefly from the fact that the population is rapidly growing "in every district of the Province, and add every year materially to the expenditure connected with the *Education, Road and Bridges, Agriculture and Administration of Justice services.*"

Now, how is it with Agriculture and Immigration? In 1871 the expenditure was \$1,074.86; in 1872, \$2,313.45, or an increase of \$1,238.59; in 1873 the expenditure was only \$1,226.87. In 1874 it was, as far as the Public Accounts show \$1,604, but as only eight months are given there it is safe to put the expenditure at \$2,000; in 1875 the same; and in 1876 the same. No increase in that item, though the subsidy has been raised on the supposition that a material increase of expenditure for the item was necessary, and on the faith of such representations was Mr. Mackenzie induced to make such increase of subsidy.

How is it with the Administration of Justice service? In 1871 \$5,429.14 was expended; in 1872, \$9,545.17, or an increase of \$4,115 15c. In 1873, \$23,056.21 (better known as the Clarke expenditure). In 1874 about \$12,000. In 1875, \$10,000, or \$2,000 less. In 1876, under an increased revenue derived on the faith of representations made to the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie that the expenditure in connection with the Administration of Justice was increasing every year, we find that the appropriation is estimated the same for 1876-7 as it was for 1875-6, and \$2,000 less than it was in 1874.

Now let us see where the material increase and expenditure has actually gone.

In 1871 Printing cost \$2,189.28. In 1872, \$9,117.11. In 1873, \$11,028.68. In 1874 ostensibly \$7,000. In 1875 \$8,000, and under an increased revenue derived under false representations, Printing is to cost \$10,000.

Take the item under Miscellaneous. In 1871 it was \$4,955.73; in 1872, \$9,513.79; in 1873, \$10,844.52; in 1874 about \$9,000; in 1875, \$10,000; and under an increased revenue derived under the representations to the Premier of the Dominion, that the increased revenue was necessary owing to the material increase in the expenditure on such services as Roads, Education, and Administration of Justice, none of which have been increased, we find that Miscellaneous has been increased from \$10,000 in 1875-6 to \$15,300 in 1876-7, while the appropriation for Education is the same as it was four years ago. That for Road Service is more than one-half less than it was in 1871, and \$1,000 less than it was last year, while the appropriation for the Administration of Justice is less than it was in 1874 by \$2,000.

Take the item marked Incidentals, and we find that in 1871 *no such item appeared.* In 1872 it had not been admitted. In 1873 it was still unheard of; but in 1875, when Mr. Davis had fairly assumed control of

the public purse, we begin to hear of the leakage of \$1,485. In 1876-7 Incidentals will have risen to the "material expenditure" of \$7,100—an item unheard of during the Archibald-Clarke Administration, but rising into vast importance during the Morris-Davis regime!

Take the much talked of Legislative Expenses. In 1871 both Houses cost \$13,695.17; in 1872, \$13,783.99; in 1873, \$14,785.89, but a slight increase over the preceding year; in 1874 about \$14,000; in 1875, \$13,600; and in 1876, with only one House, \$12,200—\$1,400 less (no material increase of expenditure here from '71 to '76).

Then take Civil Government (which of course has nothing to do with the Legislative Council). In 1871 Civil Government cost \$12,349 29; in '72, \$23,570.06; in '73, \$17,790; in '74 not less than \$15,000; in '75, \$16,850; in 1876 estimated at \$19,200, being an increase of \$2,350. Now it is clear that "the demands do not originate chiefly from the fact that the population is rapidly growing, and add every year materially to the expenditure connected with the Education, Road and Bridges, Agriculture and Administration of Justice Services," but to the "material expenditure" of increased appropriation for *general plunder* under such names as *Printing*, originally \$2,000, now \$10,000; *Miscellaneous*, originally \$4,955.73, now \$15,800; *Incidentals*, *nil*, now \$7,300. Here is the key to the whole thing, and if the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's manner of looking into the claims of Provinces be not conducted more carefully than he has conducted his examination into Manitoba affairs, it is to be hoped that he will be replaced by some one who understands his business more intelligently than he seems to.—Education \$7,000 in 1872, and \$7,000 in 1876; Agriculture and Immigration \$2,313.45 in 1872, and only \$2,000 in 1876; Justice \$23,056.21 in 1873, only \$10,000 in 1876, and yet His Eminence the Lieutenant-Governor and their Royal Highnesses the Local Government go to Ottawa and declare that their "demands for Better Terms originate chiefly from the fact that the population is rapidly growing in every district of the Province, and add every year materially to the expenditure connected with the Education, Road and Bridges, Agriculture and Administration of Justice services." Could anything be meaner or falser than what is aimed at by this statement? and how different it is from the facts and figures!

The additional revenue has been secured, but instead of applying it and the money saved by the abolition of the Legislative Council to Education, Roads, Bridges, Agriculture and Justice, it is added to Printing, Miscellaneous, and General Plunder. Let Mr. Blake and Mr. Mackenzie bear this fact in mind.

It is Edward Blake who on pages 10-11 of the Report says:

"The sub-committee of the Council, on examination of this estimate, observe that it involves an expenditure in carrying on the machinery of government of between \$50,000 and \$60,000—very nearly the whole of the actual revenue—while only between forty and fifty thousand dollars is proposed to be expended on the services of the Administration of Justice, Education and Agriculture, Public Works and Charity." "Only between forty and fifty thousand dollars!" It may have been proposed, Mr. Blake, but there was little intention of carrying out the proposal of only forty or fifty thousand dollars. The

actual proposed expenditure under the increased revenue which you and your colleagues have been graciously pleased to allow is little more than one-half the larger sum named by you, and which you, as indicating its smallness, characterize as "only" between forty and fifty thousand dollars. If that is a small sum, surely one-half of it must be ridiculously small; and yet it is all that the Local Government propose to spend on the services which you have named:

Justice	\$10,000
Education.....	7,000
Agriculture	2,000
Public Works	7,900
Charities	2,000
	<hr/>
	\$28,900

This is all, Mr. Blake, which our local rulers propose to expend on the services which you supposed "only" between forty and fifty thousand dollars would be spent upon. Nor must it be imagined that the legitimate expenses in connection with the carrying on of government have been increased. They are even less than Mr. Blake's fifty or sixty thousand dollars, as may be seen from the following figures from the estimates for the year ending the 30th of June, 1877. Civil Government is to cost \$19,200, Legislation \$12,200, and Road Service \$8,000, or a whole of \$39,400, or in round numbers \$40,000 for an expenditure in carrying on the machinery of government as Mr. Blake puts it. Here is a total of \$68,900 in the items which Mr. Blake supposed would cost us \$100,000. The difference between the above \$68,900 and the total revenue of the Province \$95,000, is \$26,900. This amount is expended for Miscellaneous, Printing, and Incidentals. Hardly a dollar of it is expended for a legitimate or honest purpose, unless corrupting a constituency, buying votes and subsidizing newspapers have been legalized by Mr. Blake and his Government as the "machinery" to carry on the Government. Perhaps it is on this account that we find these items included in the "expenditure for the machinery of Government." As I have already shown, Lieutenant-Governor Morris and Messrs. Davis & Co. had been desirous, or were still desirous, of exercising a "spirit of economy," they would hardly allow such a large expenditure in the direction of Miscellaneous, Printing and Incidentals as they propose. To consider their financial policy an honest or beneficial one to the country is preposterous. The only persons benefitted are the immediate conspirators themselves; but benefits of such a doubtful character as these generally recoil, and a general break up from the Lieutenant-Governor down (or up?) is not an improbable event.

I shall now pass on to another topic.

The history of the present Local Administration is full of iniquity, in which treachery, dishonesty and extravagance struggle for the mastery. Davis with a handful of political turncoats united with a solid French contingent of nine members, rules the country at the dictation of that unseen but not unfelt power which has ruled Canada for many a day. Though professing to be a British Province, Manitoba to all in-

tents and purposes is eminently French. Not that a majority or anything like a respectable minority of the people are French, but because there is a Richlieu pulling at the wires, and a Louis to dance attendance. In a Legislature of twenty-four members, five-twelfths are French or recognized as representatives of the French. Fourteen are supposed to represent the English speaking interests of the Province, who have won their way into the Legislature by pretending to champion the rights of the English speaking people, a majority of them turned traitors to their allegiance, and forming an alliance with nine out of ten out of the French contingent, make a combination strong in power, but inherently weak and contemptible in the estimation of the people. A man named Davis is at the head of this alliance—that is, the ostensible head—and a person named McKay, who has a political record said not to be the cleanest, is the tail. A few members of the Legislature have strenuously fought this alliance since it assumed its present shape, but the majority being political mendicants, office-seekers and contractors, have adhered to the fortunes of the Government and are reaping their reward. The Premier is a man with low but cunning capacity, but having realized a little success in a very doubtful business, is just now a very important personage; and a certain high official has been heard to say that "he never knew before there was so much in the Premier"—such is the contemptible admiration for success, no matter how acquired, which selfish humanity bestows on a little temporary prosperity.

This alliance being formed under ecclesiastical ægis, is a powerful and tyrannical combination. And being tyrannical it is of course corrupt; and being corrupt, it is of course incompetent. Fearing to have their actions controlled, they abolish the only safeguard the people had. Their career is now in full blast—no Legislative Council to interfere with their doings, and a Lieutenant-Governor who assents to all and every measure, no matter how unjust, or unfair, or unconstitutional it may be, so long as the purpose is served. The abolition of the Legislative Council was not effected without the strongest suspicions of the grossest corruption. A member of that body a year ago voted against the Bill which then sought to wipe out the Legislative Council. The attempt was a failure, but at the last session it was accomplished, and how? Perhaps this will explain. The member who a year ago voted against the Bill was in opposition to the Government. Time works changes. In the beginning of the winter he was doubly gazetted as President of the Council and Minister of Agriculture, the Minister with that portfolio having resigned to make way for the *dua juncta in uno* gentleman. That being accomplished the Bill passes by a majority of one, and that one the member who, less than three months before, was hostile to the Government, and who, less than a year previously voted against the same Bill! Would not this conduct be condemned at Ottawa or elsewhere? Is it because Manitoba is said to have no politics that her public men must have license to box the political compass within a year, and leave behind them a course as chequered as the career of the vilest carpet-bagger that ever plundered the public? If it is no sin to do these things, why not make this a sort of political Van Dieman's Land and transport hither all the Macdonalds, Mackenzies, Camerons, Smiths and Blakes that now are offensive elsewhere? The Province could not be worse off than it is if this were accomplished.

The record of the Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Council of Manitoba during its final session and final hours will serve to show what may be done by a corrupt and incompetent Ministry, backed up by a Lieutenant-Governor whose *penchant* for land speculations seems to be greater than his admiration for Constitutional Government. The following report of the proceedings will show that the old Council of Ten never did anything more arbitrary than the moribund Speaker of the Legislative Council did when he permitted a Bill to be introduced a second time, the same Bill having received the six months' hoist a few hours previously. It will be seen by the report that the Bill which came up from the Lower House received the six months hoist in the Council, but that the Speaker, who was absent on the first occasion, had it introduced as a new measure in the Legislative Council and carried it by *force*—stifling discussion and not allowing me to speak. This Bill, according to Parliamentary practice, could not be introduced during the same session; but nevertheless it was, and carried in the manner set forth in the report. His Majesty, the Lieutenant-Governor sanctioned the proceeding, also the Abolition Bill, both of which are unconstitutional under the circumstances under which they were passed.

THURSDAY, FEB. 3.

The Speaker took the chair at half-past eleven. Present—Hon. Messrs. Dr. O'Donnell, D. Gunn, Hamelin and Dauphinais.

A number of Bills were brought in from the Legislative Assembly to which concurrence was asked.

Whereupon Hon. Dr. O'Donnell complained that measures of great importance were pushed in on them at the last, which they would really have to pass or reject without reading them. The whole thing was a *faisce*. An important measure, the Education Bill, had, for instance, just made its appearance for the first time, within two hours of what was intended to be the close of the session. It was impossible hon. members could have the slightest knowledge of that or the other Bills just brought before them.

Ultimately four of the Bills—the Education Bill, the License Bill, and the one relating to Agriculture, and the Bill relating to the division of the Province into Counties, received the six months hoist.

The rejection of the first named Bill was accomplished on motion of Hon. Dr. O'Donnell, seconded by Hon. Donald Gunn.

House adjourned till half-past three.

HALF-PAST THREE P. M.

The Speaker again took the chair at half-past 3 p.m.

Present—Hon. Messrs. McKay, O'Donnell, Gunn, Dauphinais and Hamelin.

CLOSING SCENE—THE EDUCATION ACT.

Hon. Donald Gunn rose to an explanation, and if possible to have his vote rescinded. He regretted very much having seconded the motion of Hon. Dr. O'Donnell to throw out the Education Bill, and had done so on a complete misunderstanding. He desired to enter a protest against the seconding.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell argued that the vote could not be rescinded.

Speaker—The Hon. Mr. Gunn does not move to have his vote rescinded, but desires to enter a protest.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell was proceeding to show by authority that such a vote could not be rescinded, when

The Speaker again reminded the hon. gentleman that there was no such motion before the chair.

Hon. Mr. Gunn—I voted to throw out the Bill because the hon. member spoke against it, and said that no man could live in Winnipeg owing to the taxes which would be imposed under it.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—I rise to a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Gunn—I do not believe that I am out of order. I am simply stating what took place on—

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—Order, order. No question before the chair.

Hon. Mr. Gunn—Every member has a right to be heard.

Speaker—Let Mr. Gunn speak. He has a right to speak to a motion.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—Order. The whole proceeding is disorderly.

Hon. Mr. Gunn—I had not seen a copy of the Bill when I—

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—Order.

Speaker—Mr. Gunn is in order.

Hon. Mr. Gunn—I will not say that the Dr. led me astray wilfully. But I am sorry, even though it was sent in late, that we did not go into committee on the Education Bill. In rejecting it, I feel that I have not done justice to myself or to what I now believe to be a very good Bill. It was only after we adjourned that I got a copy of it, and after reading it carefully, I believe it to be an excellent measure.

Hon. Mr. McKay—I move that the Rules of the House be suspended so as to allow of the introduction of a Bill.

The Speaker put the motion.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—The Rules have already been suspended till the end of the session.

Speaker—The rule asked to be suspended is that requiring notice to be given before the introduction of a Bill.

Hon. Mr. Dauphinais seconded the motion, which carried.

Hon. Mr. McKay then introduced the Education Bill.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is now seeking to introduce the Bill which was rejected by this House at its last sitting. Without further comment I will read the rule on the subject. Here it is. May, in his Parliamentary Practice, pp. 298 and 299, says: “It is a rule in both Houses not to permit any question or Bill to be offered which is substantially the same as one on which their judgment has already been expressed in the current session. This is necessary in order to avoid contradictory decisions, to prevent surprises, and to afford proper opportunities for determining the several questions as they arise. . . . To rescind a negative vote, except in the different stages of Bills, is a proceeding that creates difficulty because the same question would have to be put again. The only means, therefore, by which a negative vote can be revoked is by proposing another question similar, in which is the general purport of that which has been rejected, but with sufficient variance to constitute

a new question, and House would determine whether it was substantially the same question or not." This effectually settles the question, and prevents the Bill being re-introduced this session. I must express my astonishment at hearing an hon. gentleman who seconded a motion this morning now rise in his place and say that he did not know what he was doing when he seconded that motion. Does he know what he is doing now? I can tell that hon. gentleman he has placed himself in a very bad position.

Speaker—The motion for the introduction and first reading is now quite in order. Here is the rule on the subject. (Reads.)

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—The whole proceeding is irregular.

Speaker—I rule that the Bill may be introduced, and give my authority. (Reads.)

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—I rise—

Speaker—Sit down.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell (emphatically)—I would have you know, Mr. Speaker, that I am here, a member of this House, and in the full exercise of the functions of my office.

Speaker—Please sit down.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—I am not through speaking.

Speaker—The hon. gentleman is out of order and must resume his seat.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—I rose to a point of order and wished to be allowed to state it.

Speaker—If the hon. gentleman will persist in speaking out of all order I must have him removed.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—All right. We'll see about that.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—The motion before the House has not a seconder. I object to it, and if in the course of my objections I think fit to stand here and talk till to-morrow or till next week, I am going to do it (laughter).

Speaker—What motion do you desire to bring before the House?

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—Wait till I get through and I'll give it to you. If you, Mr. Speaker, persist in putting the motion, I must persist in having recorded at length the clause I am about to read. And further, I claim the right to speak with as much precision and as slow as I think proper. If I choose to stand here and talk till the middle of next year, you have no power to stop me (applause from outsiders).

Hon. Mr. McKay called the Speaker's attention to the fact that there were strangers in the House.

The Speaker ordered the House to be cleared, whereupon all the spectators were put out except the reporters.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—This cannot be done. If you clear the House reporters and all must go.

The reporters remained where they were.

Speaker—There is nothing before the House. Is it the wish of any hon. gentleman to move its first reading?

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—That motion was put.

Hon. Mr. McKay—I simply introduced the Bill, and did not move its first reading.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—I claim that the Bill cannot be introduced.

Hon. Mr. McKay—I now move the first reading of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Gunn—I second the motion.

Speaker—Is it the pleasure—

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—I have a word to say before that question is put. Do you persist in putting the motion?

Speaker—If the hon. gentleman would stop speaking it might be more to the purpose.

The Speaker said—Mr. Clerk, read the title of the Bill.

The Clerk read the Bill a first time.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—if the Speaker insists on putting the motion, I will move that the whole of the Bill be written out on the journals. This attempt to choke me off is one of those pieces of sharp practice which have been indulged in ever since the House was a House. It is to be regretted that members of this and the other Chamber should lend themselves whenever needed to the little tricks of the Government. The question I wish to raise is this: that this Bill cannot be reintroduced this session, and as the question is a comparatively new one here, I will again cite my authority. It is laid down distinctly: “The only means, therefore, by which a negative vote can be revoked, is by proposing another question similar, in which the general purport of that which has been rejected is embodied, but with sufficient variance to constitute a new question, and the House would determine whether it was substantially the same question or not.” Before that can be done, Mr. Speaker, I claim that the Bill sought to be introduced must be read clause by clause and compared with the Bill which was rejected. Is that according to your authority, Mr. Speaker? Why, the book you have been quoting from may have been in the ark for aught you know. (Laughter.) The volume I read from was printed in 1874, the Speaker's in 1848. I claim that the ruling of this House must be governed by the most recent precedents.

Hon. Mr. McKay moved the second reading.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—I object. No motion has a right to be put till I enter my protest.

Speaker—Shall the motion for the second reading be—

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell (indignantly)—The Speaker has the same right as any other member, and no more. I object to being disturbed and tyrannized over, even by the Speaker.

Speaker—Shall the motion be carried?

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—No; the Speaker might as well do the whole business himself, and dispense with the House. How is it, he continued, that gentlemen calling themselves honorable, can sit in their seats and see such an outrage as this perpetrated in a British House of Parliament?

Bill read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Dauphinais, seconded by Hon. Mr. McKay, moved the second reading.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell—Will you allow me to record my protest?

Speaker—Yes, certainly. You can have this recorded on the journals.

Hon. Dr. O'Donnell handed in his protest to the Clerk.

Bill read a third time and passed.

But Lieutenant-Governor Morris is perhaps not the only Dominion official who *interferes* in matters local. Individuals employed in the Civil Service Department on permanent salaries too often meddle in affairs that should not concern them, and supernumeraries who have important judicial situations in prospect should be the last to meddle in local politics and use their influence, no matter how contemptible, in abusing or misrepresenting those who are fighting the battle of local reform in this Province. Eastern papers should not be gulled by the statements made by those who are recognized and known as party pensioners and applicants for gubernatorial and other favors. These things may not come under the eye of a Toronto journal, but they appear as plain to the residents here as the most eminent pike staff.

There are three measures that Manitoba requires just as much as she does Better Terms. The first is a new Redistribution Bill. The second is the abolition of the French language and French distinction; and the third is a new Education Bill. These measures are absolutely necessary to the welfare, peace and prosperity of the country. The people have fought for these measures for some time, but broken faith and treachery have cruelly defeated their hopes. Ottawa has already set the example of breaking up the compact with us, and with British Columbia. If we *must* have the French language thrust down our throats, and our public revenue absorbed by French emissaries, let Ottawa pay for it. The time has come when this nuisance must be crushed, and let us hope that the right kind of men will rise to the surface and accomplish what a Davis or a Norquay, a Luxton or a Morris has been incapable of carrying out.

I have carried these pages farther than I had intended; still, there is much I would like to touch upon which I must reluctantly leave out. To show that I am not alone in my views respecting the "spirit of economy" which has moved the Government, I will conclude this imperfect sketch with an extract from a speech delivered by Dr. Cowan in the Local Assembly at its last session. Dr. Cowan is not, I believe, accused of being an out and out opponent of the Government, though his language on this occasion appears to have had no uncertain sound:

"Dr. Cowan asked how this was. They voted a sum of \$2,000 for purposes of Agriculture, and they had to pay \$500 to a man to regulate the spending of it (laughter). It was very much to be regretted that they had on this occasion placed the member for Kildonan in the chair, as he was the only out and out opposition member in the House (laughter). Last year the hon. gentleman made an excellent speech on the estimates, showing how little retrenchment was in the Government policy, and this year he would have had ample grounds for such another speech. The item for Grant's horse, about which the Premier had said so much, reminded him of the singular manner in which some gentlemen in the House changed sides. Last year an hon. gentleman whose wishes in respect to this horse had been thwarted in every way by the Government, had voted against them steadily. This year that member had voted just as steadily for the Government. Whether or not this change had been brought about owing to that item about this horse in the estimates, it was not for him (Cowan) to say. One notable fact in connection with the estimates was, that despite all the boasted

economy of the Government, they were getting larger. The House was promised that the abolition of the Legislative Council would effect a saving of from \$8,000 to \$7,000. Well, the Council had been abolished—not a dollar appeared for the Second Chamber in the estimates—and yet the expenditure went on increasing. He could not understand it."

These are the utterances of a member from an important constituency, and of a gentleman who seems disposed to do his duty by his constituents.

I cannot close without a remark or two about the Minister of Public Works, Hon. Mr. Royal. His well known fondness for office enables him to be always in power. Governments may come and go, but he would go on forever. He is the politician of fortune, though I doubt very much if his king would care about losing the services of such a faithful soldier; and so long as there are powers and contingents behind the throne we must expect Joseph to wear the variegated coat.

A word or two more about the Better Terms delegation. There is some contradiction in the terms of the report. We have already seen that it was urged before the Ottawa Government that the demands for increased revenue originated chiefly from the fact that the population of the Province was rapidly increasing, etc. On page 4 of the delegates' petition we find the following over the signatures of Messrs. Royal and Davis :

"The claims of the Province were urged *solely* on the grounds of justice and equity, and by the comparison of the terms upon which Manitoba entered Confederation and the terms that were granted before and after to some of the sister Provinces." We know this statement to be quite false, though it would have been better if it were true, as the claims of the Local Government, based solely upon the "spirit of economy" which they had infused into the administration of public affairs, would have been a hollow sham. But the occasion was not to be lost, and Messrs. Davis, Royal & Co. sought to establish good characters for themselves before Mr. Mackenzie and his associates, hence came the figures and statements which, if Mr. Mackenzie had examined, might have satisfied him that the delegates were a pair of political imposters trying to raise money under false pretences, and seeking to whitewash their political reputations.

That the Province has just and equitable direct claims against the Dominion I would be the last to deny. She has more—she has indirect claims for which the Dominion is responsible; but these latter cannot be exacted. The former, however, should be demanded as a right, not as a favor. A Province that contributes upwards of two hundred thousand dollars per annum to the Dominion Treasury in the shape of custom duties and gets in return a paltry \$60,000, has more to claim than a suppliant favor; nevertheless the Dominion Government are the custodians of our rights to a very great extent, and while dealing with us honestly and fairly, they should not repose the fullest confidence in the representations of political aspirants who obtained power by fraud and retain it by intrigue. It would be well to examine and investigate, and not take things for granted as Mr. Mackenzie seems to have done; nor was it a wise step to place an increased subsidy in

the lands of men who had not given sufficient assurance of their honesty or reliance. Lastly, it was questionable to insist on an amendment to the constitution without an appeal to the people, merely on the supposed grounds of economy. That that economy was mythical we have already shown.

It is useless to talk about climate, soil and resources, as if these things were not subsidiary to good and honest government, freedom of opinion, honest, fearless journalism, and wise legislation. Mexico is a finer, richer and naturally more productive country than Manitoba, but to what has bad government, class legislation and ignorance driven her? The people of Manitoba must, with a long pull and a strong pull, root out those prejudices that would give us a second Quebec for a second Ontario—send into oblivion those men whom mere chance has sent to the surface as rotten apples, and Manitoba will be free, happy and prosperous.

N.B.—On a future occasion I will take up the School Question and the Half-Breed Reserves appertaining to Parishes, shewing who originated the scheme.

